

## **Minutes from June 2, 2011**

### **P-20 Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Committee—Leadership System Alignment Subcommittee**

1 p.m. to 2 p.m.

#### **Present:**

Erika Hunt, Lisa Hood, Barbara Crock (Chicago New Teacher Center), Gail Fahey (DuPage Regional Office of Education), Dan Lamboley (Unit 5 principal), Teri Talan (McCormick Center for Early Childhood Leadership, Nat'l Louis), Jess House (Western Illinois University), Ann Courter (p-20 staff)

Erika talked about the passage of SB 1799, the new Article 21 bill. This committee will work to set the tone for the rulemaking that will follow.

Lisa explained the committee's task as providing assistance to ISBE and IBHE on how to better align existing support structures affecting school leaders, preschool through grade 12, and leader prep programs. She prepared a draft crosswalk of preparation, professional development, mentoring, and evaluation initiatives to examine gaps and alignment. The plan is to shape recommendations around new principal mentoring and development, training for teacher and principal evaluations, and principal preparation programs redesign. The crosswalk will also be used as a guide to inform indicators for the P-12 leadership dashboard. The aim is to encourage thinking outside the usual silos.

The crosswalk identifies 10 common themes in 7 documented standards currently in use and in statute, as well as 7 alternative leadership standards not mandated in Illinois programs. The committee members suggested additions to the lists: the Chicago Public School Critical Competencies, NAEYC competencies for effective leaders, the National Teacher Leader Endorsement Standards, and Technical Standards (NETS-A). It was also suggested that other states' approaches be added, including Florida and Louisiana's evaluation standards, and Val Ed, and also other countries, including Singapore, Great Britain, and Canada (Ontario).

Erika noted that this committee needs to think futuristically and stretch the thinking of the education system. Online opportunities, technology competencies, and cloud-based computing will change professional development going forward. The CCSSO White Paper, "Transforming Teaching and Leading" highlights future changes.

The committee suggested further development of the themes in the crosswalk, noting that organizational climate is not the same as school culture. There is a need to develop a common language, especially around what professional development means. "Distributed leadership" may take on a different meaning as future work is organized around teams.

Next steps: Lisa will revise the cross-walk. Another conference call will be scheduled for this sub-committee, and webinars will be scheduled to work on the dashboard. The full teacher and leadership effectiveness committee will meet on July 25 in Normal.

## **Minutes from June 2, 2011**

### **P-20 Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Committee meeting about Dashboard Project**

2 p.m. to 3 p.m.

Present:

Audrey Soglin, Vicki Chou, David Prasse, Barb Crock, Erika Hunt, Jess House, Dan Lamboley, Linda Tomlinson, Gail Fahey, Lisa Hood, Teri Talan, Jim O'Connor, Josh Anderson, Tracey Dell'Angela, Ann Courter

Linda Tomlinson explained the progress of the Longitudinal Data System and how it will link to teacher prep programs. There are 2 systems: 1) all courses have been defined and data entered by course, teacher, and school; 2) an RFP has just been issued to develop a compatible system for teacher service records and the teacher certification system. The 2 systems will merge, and then information will be available to teacher prep programs to follow student gains of their graduates. For the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund grant, ISBE surveyed schools about evaluation practices, but it is not yet complete. There will be capacity to gather district-level evaluation data for teachers, school support personnel, and principals. No individual data will be published. When the shift is made to assessment of the Common Core through PARCC instruments, gain comparisons will be interrupted. It will be necessary to communicate what PEAC evaluation categories are based on, that "proficient" is a fine rating.

[From [http://www.isbe.net/GMWG/pdf/gmwg\\_final\\_report\\_0411.pdf](http://www.isbe.net/GMWG/pdf/gmwg_final_report_0411.pdf) "The new system will build upon and greatly enhance the current Student Information System (SIS) by assigning unique student, teacher, and administrator identifiers that enable linking of student data with teacher, administrator, and school data over time and across educational systems from early childhood to postsecondary. Since 2006, ISBE has assigned students a unique identifier which enables tracking of students and their ISAT, IMAGE, PSAE, IAA, and ACCESS test results over time and across all K-12 public schools in Illinois. In 2009, students in public early childhood programs were added to SIS. ISBE will have the capacity to match teachers to students and courses and teachers to teacher preparation programs by September 30, 2011. The ability to link teachers, students and courses over time is an essential element in most growth models. Federal funding for the development of the ILDS runs through the fourth quarter of 2013, at which time the data system and support infrastructure will be fully functional and integrated into state and local reporting and accountability systems....As a member of PARCC, Illinois is on track to adopt new state assessments aligned with the Common Core State Standards in mathematics and literacy/ELA in grades 3–high school. Piloting and field testing will take place in 2011–2012, 2012–2013, and 2013–2014. As a governing board member, Illinois will participate in the pilot and field tests. Full statewide administration will be in the 2014–2015 school year, with 2015–2016 being the first year in which student growth can be calculated."]

Josh asked what this would mean for a 5<sup>th</sup> grade teacher. ISBE would have student growth data from the ISAT or another test, the teacher's evaluation rating, and the undergraduate institution, concentration, basic skills and content test scores. Higher ed wants data to show which teacher prep programs are preparing teachers for success.

Audrey noted that it is also important to know the conditions in the teacher's building and the quality of building leadership, perhaps through the climate survey, as well as the demographics of the school, to fairly evaluate the prep program success. A discussion of how demographic data is factored into some value-added measures followed.

Linda explained that the growth model committee has finished its work and is now piloting 3 ways to measure growth this spring: 1) Value Table or Transition model, from Delaware and Michigan; 2) Meyer and Dokumaci Value Added Model (used by CPS) 3) Betebenner student normative growth

analysis. Results of the pilots will be provided to Chris Koch. By October 31, 2011, ISBE must have in place a system for reporting student growth data in reading/language arts and mathematics to schools and LEAs for accountability purposes. Development of the student growth model for accountability runs concurrently with the development of a teacher and principal performance evaluation process in which ISBE must provide student growth data on their current students and the students they taught in the previous year. Implementation of the teacher and principal performance evaluation process begins September 1, 2012. They are still defining the data needed.

The growth results will be compared with evaluation results to ensure the teacher evaluation system is working. They will include as much data as possible, gathered over at least 3 years: 2008-11.

Jess House referred to the 1966 Coleman Study finding that the biggest cause of variance in student achievement is student's socio-economic status and maternal educational attainment. Much more than teacher effectiveness factors into student outcomes. Linda agreed that we don't want the data to be misused and Josh clarified that the purpose of a value-added growth model is to account for outside factors that impact student's learning.

How to report the data and results back to the institution or the public has not been decided. There hasn't been a discussion with higher ed yet. They do not plan to post information about individual institutions. Audrey noted that for schools, reporting the number of low performing teachers would create an incentive to inflate the ratings to appease parents. Linda noted that it is too early to know how evaluations will work, and validity and reliability are very important.

Teri Talan asked what data is being collected for kids prior to grade 4, and how many of the child's early teachers were certified in early childhood. It was requested that ISBE add that data. It was noted that quality assessments for younger grades won't be available in Illinois for years.

Josh explained the committee's goal, as written in the 12/2010 report to the P-20 Council, to put together a dashboard to show how the state is progressing in improving teacher and leader quality, in the aggregate. The committee noted that it is important to identify the audience for the dashboard. Questions will be different for institutions, the public, and policymakers, for example. It is also important to identify the sources of the data.

Jim presented a summary of leader and teacher dashboards in other states: Louisiana, Tennessee, and Ohio. He noted that the effectiveness of different programs within the same institution often varies, so program-level data should be gathered.

The committee noted that the support new teachers receive through induction and mentoring programs varies widely, and that would have an impact on teacher effectiveness that is out of the control of the prep programs. If possible, that factor should be added to any evaluation model for teachers.

Erika noted that the U.S. News study is creating pressure on prep programs, but we have an opportunity to develop our own evaluation system in Illinois.

Audrey asked for student achievement results from Louisiana.

#### Next Steps:

Jim and Michelle Seelbach will compile a list of possible baseline data categories. By next Thursday, committee members are asked to send to Erika and Josh:

- 1) 4 questions that the dashboard should answer
- 2) who is the audience
- 3) potential metrics

There will be 2 webinars before July 25, and the committee will present a draft dashboard at the July 25 meeting.

**Minutes from June 2, 2011**

**P-20 Teacher Effectiveness Subcommittee—Teach for America’s Approach to Selection of Teachers**

3 p.m. to 5 p.m.

Present:

Brad White, Audrey Soglin, Erika Hunt, Vicki Chou, Anne Hoffman, Tracey Dell’Angela, David Prasse, Lisa Hood, Robin Steans, Dave L\_\_\_\_, Jason \_\_\_\_\_, Josh Anderson, Jim O’Connor, Ann Courter

This committee seeks to develop a fully built predictive admissions model. The focus of the work this year is on: 1) certification and Article 21 rules; 2) a predictive admissions model for state teacher prep programs in 3-5 years; 3) a user-friendly dashboard to track state progress; 4) a high-quality climate survey, with particular focus on the teacher-supervisor relationship.

Josh introduced the speaker from Teach for America, Sean Waldheim. TFA has 48,000 applicants and 1200 interviewers. They have been working on and constantly fine-tuning a selection model that will produce the greatest student academic gains. They started the work with a qualitative study of what differentiated the outliers, the most successful teachers from the least successful teachers, and worked to create a system to recognize that potential and the teacher selection stage.

The TFA model produces a score for each candidate, based on data sources and models that are constantly revised. Student gain data is based on EPAS or some other pre- and post- test given by TFA teachers, not on ISAT (results not available soon enough). They look for 1.5 years of growth each year. Trends are different across different data sources, so they use authentication by people who have worked closely with the teachers over the year. TFA always has balanced quantitative with qualitative measures in candidate assessment.

David Prasse asked whether any of the TFA models have been submitted to a peer-review process. Sean responded that a study using a value-added model is being done in New York, and results are expected in about a year. Preliminary results look good for 3 of the TFA competencies: achievement (results in a variety of sectors, including GPA in Jr. and Sr. year, extracurricular, work); perseverance (interview account of personal response to challenge in work or activities, with probing follow-up questions); and critical thinking. Grit is evolving: remains optimistic about own ability to reach goals through effort and works through obstacles purposefully and relentlessly, along with deepening involvement in activities over multiple years. They are working with Angela Duckworth at Penn.

Other competencies now being tested against student gains data are: organizational activity, influencing/motivating, building relationships in diverse settings, grit, and fit with TFA. They have dropped constant learning as a competency. They collected self-reported ACT scores, but found no relationship to student achievement, possibly because of ceiling effect. TFA sees 15% of its applicants coming from career-changers, mostly in the 23-32 year old range.

David Prasse noted that with 1.6 million new teachers needed, the U.S. must look beyond traditional 4-year institution teacher-prep programs for new pipelines into the profession.

Tracey asked how TFA has responded as the understanding of evaluation measures and validity has changed dramatically over the past decade. Josh noted that TFA considered developing a national test to measure growth, but opted instead to let their teachers choose from a limited menu of assessments. Many of the charter schools where TFA teachers are placed are using the same suite of assessments, which is convenient. The focus is on teachers' year one performance.

As part of the interview process, sample lessons are requested, and reviewers measure the competencies in the lesson presentation. The work for inter-rater reliability, and make all information about the candidate's performance in earlier interviews available to the interviewer.

Brad White presented an overview of the research on indicators in teacher assessment and qualification. It is important to use multiple indicators, because less than 10% of teacher effects can be explained by a single indicator. Experience matters, but was not covered in the research he reviewed. Value-added test score data was used in all the studies. Findings:

- academic aptitude matters, especially for at-risk students
- undergraduate school competitiveness ranking also matters
- basic skills test predicts how teacher will do on the content test, but doesn't predict effectiveness
- content tests matter for high school math instruction
- emergency certification yields ineffective teachers
- alternate certification routes vary widely (TFA gets good results)
- National Board certification identifies good teachers, doesn't make them better
- MA degrees don't improve effectiveness

Much research is on-going in pedagogical content knowledge

Brad's rank order:

- 1) performance during student teaching if measure of performance is a good one
- 2) academic aptitude
- 3) pedagogical content knowledge for math
- 4) content knowledge
- 5) pedagogical knowledge

There was a discussion of the IERC's Index of Teacher Academic Capital, which showed a small relationship with student learning when value-added assessment was available. The IERC may repeat the study in the future.

Next steps:

Volunteers were asked to step forward to work on the dashboard. Its purpose is to make a clear public statement of how we are doing as districts and as a state in recruitment of teachers, evaluation, and retention.

The committee noted that the lesson from Louisiana's dashboard was the importance of a collaborative development process, with rules on data use and help from entities in using data. Clear questions to be answered and a strong communications plan with stakeholders and the public are very important.